

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignim 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,255	05/04/2001	Dennis Charles Clemes	032228.0006	6320	
30678	7590 07/25/2003				
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP SUITE 800 1990 M STREET NW			EXAMINER		
			BRUENJES, CHRISTOPHER P		
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3425			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	/1	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003	1 (

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. ′			•	AS-
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	Advisory Action	09/848,255	CLEMES ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Christopher P Bruenjes	1772	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with	th correspondence address	
Ther final cond	REPLY FILED 08 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T efore, further action by the applicant is required to rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appnination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this a (1) a timely filed amendmen	pplication. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in	ued
	PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a)		•		
b)	event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing on SIX MONTHS ON THE MONTHS O	late of the final rejection. F THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
have b 37 CF (b) ab	extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The obsern filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extending the period of extending the shorten over the contraction of the shorten over, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three respectively the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount led statutory period for reply originally	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee set in the final Office action; or (2) as set	under forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		•	
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furt	ther consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simplifying	ng the
(they present additional claims without cance NOTE: 	eling a corresponding numbe	r of finally rejected claims.	
3.[Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejo	ection(s):		
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted in	n a separate, timely filed amend	iment
5.⊠	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		considered but does NOT place	the
6.□	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were newly	/
7.🛛		• • •	•	
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	•	· •	
	Claim(s) allowed:			
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected: 1.			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□ d	sapproved by the Examiner.	
9.[Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No	(s)	
10.	Other:			
	-			

Art Unit: 1772

ADVISORY ACTION

REPEATED REJECTIONS

1. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 1 over Razeto et al in view of Clemes is repeated for the reasons previously of record in Paper #3, Pages 2-4 Paragraph 1.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

2. Applicant's arguments filed in Paper #5 regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 1 over Razeto et al in view of Clemes have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Razeto in combination with Clemes do not meet every limitation, Razeto in Figure 2 teaches that Figure 4 represents layer 18, by showing that Figure 4 is a magnified representation of layer 18 in Figure 2. Although the specification may present other situations in which layer 18 is not represented by Figure 4, the disclosure based on the drawings do teach layer 18 comprising a paper layer and polyethylene coating layer. Furthermore, reference numbers 12 and 14 are thermal seals and inherently in order to thermal seal layers together the two layers are similar plastics, since layer 16 has an inner layer of polyethylene, layer 18 inherently also has an inner layer of polyethylene in order to form a thermal seal between the two layers.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,255

Art Unit: 1772

Razeto further discloses that the paper of layer 18 is impregnated with a gas releasing mixture, and it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill that part of the impregnated gas releasing mixture would remain on the surface and would therefore be present between the paper and plastic layers. Also, the impregnation of the paper layer with the gas releasing mixture and a coating of polyethylene has an equivalent function to a coating of a gas releasing mixture between the paper layer and a coating of polyethylene. Both function to release gas quickly in order to preserve fruits and vegetables before the slow diffusion of gas from the granulated material in the pocket. formed by the two sheets heat sealed together. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that taking a gas releasing mixture and coating it onto a paper layer or impregnating the paper layer serve the same function and

Page 3

Conclusion

determining which method of adding the mixture to the structure

to use would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art,

absent the showing of unexpected result.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P Bruenjes whose telephone number is 703-305-3440.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,255

Art Unit: 1772

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 703-308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Christopher P Bruenjes

Examiner

Art Unit 1772

ann (1- 12-

July 23, 2003

SANDRA M. NOLAN PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 4